UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,024	11/18/2003	Samuel W. Bent	MS306031.1/60001.0313US01	6718

7590 10/17/2007

Homer Knearl
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
SALOMON, PHENUEL S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/717,024	BENT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phenuel S. Salomon	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *8/3/07*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-13 and 15-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-13 and 15-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment file on August 03, 2007.

2. Claims 1 and 9 are amended, claims 2 and 14 are cancelled, claim 19 is newly added, and 1, 3-13 and 15-19 are pending.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 3-8, 10-13, and 15-19 are objected to because of the following informalities: these claims are dependent claims and they should begin with the word "The" as referred to the parent claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bushe (US 6,978,422).

Claim 1: Bushe discloses a computer system having an operating system platform, a user interface framework system for rendering data according to a visual style defined for the data type, the system comprising:

a plurality of objects, wherein the plurality of objects have one or more data fields; (col. 5, line 21-30).

a style definition module for holding one or more visual style definitions to be selectively applied to the plurality of objects; (col. 11, lines 6-14 and fig. 4)

a style lookup module for locating an associated visual style definition (col. 11, lines 6-14 and fig. 4); [Since style definitions define how the master view, task selections, managed object selections and data are to be displayed; therefore, style lookup is inherent].

a binding (mapping) module for binding the one or more data fields to one of a properties of the appropriate visual style definition; (col. 5, lines 28-30).

a tree assembler module for generating a visual representation of the data based on the appropriate visual style definition; (col.11, lines 6-22).

a user interface element factory having additional user interface elements (col. 9, lines 13-24);

a layout engine for adding one or more of the additional user interface elements to the visual tree (data dictionary) after the appropriate visual style definition has been bound to the one or more data fields (col. 9, lines 13-17) [the data dictionary can be updated with new managed resources after additional managed resources become available. That implies resources have been through the binding process]; and

a rendering engine which uses the visual tree(data dictionary) passed to the layout engine (view renderer) to render the data for display (col. 15, lines 36-48 and fig. 4).

Claim 3: Bushe discloses the system as in claim 1 above, wherein the objects are independent from the visual styles. (col. 19, lines 66-67 and col.20, lines 1-8).

Claim 4: Bushe discloses the system as in claim 1 above, wherein the tree assembler (XML parser) module builds a visual tree to represent the visual elements of the display. (col. 3, lines 21-38).

Claim 5: Bushe discloses the system as in claim 1 above, wherein the plurality of objects are displayed as a list (col. 17, lines 49-60).

Claim 6: Bushe discloses the system as in claim 1 above, wherein the plurality of objects are displayed as a menu (col. 14, lines 18-30).

Claim 8: Bushe discloses the system as in claim 1 above, wherein the objects form a group, and wherein the system further comprises a group visual style definition and wherein the tree assembler module generates the visual representation based on the group visual style, the group visual style being independently defined from the data items. (col. 14, lines 17-52 and fig. 3)

Claim 9: Bushe discloses a method of displaying data according to an appropriate visual style comprising:

receiving a request to display one or more data items; (col. 16, lines 43-45).

locating the appropriate visual style, wherein the appropriate visual style is independently defined from the one or more data items; (col. 18, lines 54-58).

generating a visual tree (expanded set of object selections) using the one or more data items and the appropriate visual style; (col.17, lines 6-20).

binding (mapping) properties in the visual tree to properties of the one or more data items; (col. 15, lines 14-23).

adding additional user interface elements to the visual tree after the properties in the visual tree have been bound to the one or more data items (col. 5, lines 1-6 and fig. 4) [additional views can be created or existing views can be modified for resource management before or after the creation of a resource management application while managed object data associated with managed resources were already mapped]; and

rendering the display based on the visual tree having the additional user interface elements (col. 5, lines 6-15) [a resource management application can incorporate any additional or newly defined views which are to be applied and a new view will display resource data resulting from the application of the task to the selected resources].

Claim 10: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 9 above, further comprising declaring the data items using data objects (col.19, lines 53-61).

Claim 11: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 9 above, further comprising:
automatically updating the visual tree in response to a change to a relevant data item. (col. 9, lines 13-20)

Claim 12: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 11 above, wherein the change to a relevant data item. involves the addition of a relevant data item (col. 9, lines 3-11).

Claim 13: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 11 above, wherein the change to a relevant data item involves the deletion of a relevant data item (col. 9, lines 3-11).

Claim 15: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 9 above, wherein the data items form a list (col. 17, lines 49-60).

Claim 16: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 9 above, wherein the data items form a menu box.(col. 14, lines 18-30).

Claim 18: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 9 above, further comprising:

defining (determine) a visual style for a group (col. 17, lines 1-5);

associating the data items with the group (col. 17, lines 6-15);

in response to the request to display the data items, locating (identifying) the visual style for the group (col. 16, lines 16-21); and

generating the visual tree based on the visual style for the group (col. 17, lines 6-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushe (US 6,978,422) in view of Hanggie (US 2003/0231204 A1).

Claim 7: Bushe discloses a system as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose a plurality of objects are displayed as a combo box. However, Hanggie discloses a "themeable user interface elements include controls such as a graphically displayed push button, combo box..."(page 4, par. [0040]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature in Bushe. One would have been motivated to do it in order to provide application developers better ways to combine user interface and elements with data.

Claim 17: Bushe discloses the method as in claim 9 above, but does not explicitly disclose the data items form as a combination box. However, Hanggie discloses a "themeable user interface elements include controls such as a graphically displayed push button, combo box..."(page 4, par. [0040]). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature in Bushe. One would have been motivated to do it in order to provide application developers better ways to combine user interface and elements with data.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushe (US 6,978,422) in view of Lynch et al. (US 6,558,431 B1).

Claim 19: Bushe discloses a method as defined in claim 9 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

detecting a change dynamically in a relevant data item;

invalidating the visual tree;

recognizing the invalidation of the visual tree; and

in response to recognizing the invalidation of the visual tree, regenerating the necessary portions of the visual tree; and

re-rendering the display based on the regenerated visual tree.

However, Lynch discloses:

detecting a change dynamically in a relevant data item (col. 4, lines 53-57);

invalidating the visual tree (col. 6, lines 1-28);

recognizing the invalidation of the visual tree (col. 6, lines 1-28);

in response to recognizing the invalidation of the visual tree, regenerating the necessary portions of the visual tree (col. 6, lines 41-52); and

re-rendering the display based on the regenerated visual tree (col. 7, lines 46-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these features in Bushe. One would have been motivated to do so in order to modify the display in response to changes in data items.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/03/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1, applicant argues:

a). Bushe et al. does not have separate structures or elements where, after a visual style has been bound to one or more data fields from a style definition module 310, that additional user interface elements in a separate structure (user interface element factory 324, FIG. 3 in the specification) are added by a layout engine 322 and then rendered by a rendering engine 320. All of these structures or elements and functions are claimed in amended claim 1.

In response, examiner notes that the limitation "separate structures or elements where, after a visual style has been bound to one or more data fields from a style definition module 310, that additional user interface elements in a separate structure (user interface element factory 324, FIG. 3 in the specification) are added by a layout engine 322 and then rendered by a rendering engine 320" is not recited in claim 1

b). Bushe et al. does not teach or disclose a separate user interface element factory 324 (page 12, lines 24-29 in the specification), which is in addition to the style definitions module 310 (page 10, lines 12-20 in the specification) disclosed by applicant.

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Bushe et al. discloses this feature at (col. 9, lines 13-24) "additional managed resources that become available for management by a resource management application".

Applicant further argues "The separate user interface element factory allows additional user interface elements to be applied to the data after the stored style definitions have already been applied. These additional user interface elements are applied through a separate layout engine (page 12, lines 24-29 in the specification), which is different and distinct from the rendering engine (page 12, lines 21-24 in the specification)".

Examiner notes that the limitations "The separate user interface element factory allows additional user interface elements to be applied to the data after the stored style definitions have already been applied" and "These additional user interface elements are applied through a separate layout engine" are not recited in claim 1.

c). Bushe et al. does not teach or suggest this added functionality, which essentially is a ***post processing operation performed after style definitions have been applied***, and can be used to "determine where to place certain display items and how large to make them relative to the physical characteristics of a particular computer system" (see page 12, lines 27-29 in the specification).

In response, examiner notes that the limitation "added functionality, which essentially is a ***post processing operation performed after style definitions have been applied***, and can be used to "determine where to place certain display items and how large to make them relative to the physical characteristics of a particular computer system" (see page 12, lines 27-29 in the specification)" is not recited in claim 1.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "The separate user interface element factory allows additional user interface elements to be applied to the data after the stored style definitions have already been applied" and "These additional user interface elements are applied through a separate layout engine", "post processing operation performed after style definitions have been applied" and "determine where to place certain display items and how large to make them relative to the physical characteristics of a particular computer system") are not recited in the rejected claim 1. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With respect to claim 9, applicant argues:

Neither Bushe et al. nor Lynch et al. does not teach or suggest: "adding additional user interface elements to the visual tree after the properties in the visual tree have been bound to the one or more data items"

"rendering the display based on the visual tree having the additional user interface elements"

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees, the limitations "adding additional user interface elements to the visual tree after the properties in the visual tree have been bound to the one or more data items" and "rendering the display based on the visual tree having the additional user interface elements" were not previously presented and have been added in this amendment. These newly added limitations change the scope of claim 9.

With respect to claim 7, applicant argues:

Bushe et al. does not teach or suggest all the elements and limitations of Applicant's independent claim 1.

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees and refers the applicant to the above response to arguments concerning claim 1.

With respect to claim 17, applicant argues:

Applicant believes that Bushe et al. in combination with Lynch et al. does not render claim 9 obvious. Therefore, combining Hanggie et al. with the teaching of Bushe et al. and Lynch et al. would not arrive at Applicant's claimed invention in claim 17.

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees and refers the applicant to the above response to arguments concerning claim 9.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Uchiyama et al. (EP 0865000 A2) discloses image processing method and apparatus.

b. Bhargava et al. (US 6219055 B1) discloses computer based forming tool.

c. Bestgen et al. (US 6915290 B2) discloses database query optimization apparatus....

d. David et al.. (US 2004/0189669 A1) discloses system and method for managing visual structure....

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phenuel S. Salomon whose telephone number is (571) 270-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.(Alternate Friday Off) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272 4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PSS

10/10/2007

Stephen Hong

Supervisory Primary Examiner